

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ERIC R. TOWNSEL,	)	CASE NO. C07-0482-JLR-MAT
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S PENDING
v.	)	MOTIONS TO ADMIT ADDRESSES
	)	AND TO GRANT RELIEF FROM
KEN QUINN, et al.,	)	PRIOR ORDER OF DISMISSAL
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This is a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Currently pending are plaintiff's motions to admit into the record the addresses of the two defendants who remain in this action, and to grant relief from the prior order of the Court dismissing defendants from this action. The Court, having reviewed these motions, and the balance of the record, does hereby find and ORDER as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's motion to admit into the record the addresses of the two defendants who remain in this action (Dkt. No. 105) is GRANTED. The Court, in conjunction with this Order, will issue an Order directing service on these two individuals.

(2) Plaintiff's motion for relief from the Court's prior order dismissing defendants from

ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S PENDING MOTIONS TO  
ADMIT ADDRESSES AND TO GRANT RELIEF  
FROM PRIOR ORDER OF DISMISSAL  
PAGE -1

01 this action (Dkt. No. 108) is DENIED. Plaintiff, by way of the instant motion, seeks relief under  
02 Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) from the Court's prior order dismissing certain defendants from this action  
03 on the grounds that he now has documents in his possession which establish the liability of those  
04 individuals. Plaintiff complains that this Court has refused to allow him to enter these newly  
05 discovered documents into the record.

06 On May 20, 2008, this Court did, in fact, issue an Order denying plaintiff leave to admit  
07 into the record documents which he believed would establish the liability of defendants who had  
08 previously been dismissed from this action. (*See* Dkt. No. 101). The Court explained in its Order  
09 that it would serve no purpose to admit such documents given that the claims against the  
10 defendants in question had been dismissed with prejudice. (*Id.* a 1-2.) The Court has now  
11 reviewed the documents previously submitted by plaintiff in light of his instant motion for relief  
12 under Fed. Rule Civ. P. 60(b) and concludes that those documents in no way undermine the  
13 validity of the Court's prior order of dismissal because, contrary to plaintiff's assertions, those  
14 documents do not establish the liability of any of the previously dismissed defendants.

15 (3) The Clerk shall send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for defendants, and  
16 to the Honorable James L. Robart.

17 DATED this 8th day of July, 2008.

18   
19 Mary Alice Theiler  
20 United States Magistrate Judge  
21  
22